UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/521,448	03/07/2000	Yoshiki Watanabe	21.1932	1165

21171 7590 04/18/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
TRAN, MYLINH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/521,448	WATANABE, YOSHIKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mylinh Tran	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 January 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,7-9 and 11-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,7-9 and 11-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 March 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date [redacted]. 1/26/05
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's RCE filed 01/26/05 has been entered and carefully considered. However, Applicant has not amended anything since the Final Office Action mailed 05/05/04. Therefore, these claims are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed (05/05/04).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ertemalp [US. 5,745,110] in view of Leong et al. [US. 5,513,342].

As to claims 1, 5 and 9, Ertemalp discloses a layout control device forming a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns defining the layout, the layout formed based on a schedule quantity inside a plurality of display units (figure 11, column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 2); a display control device controlling display of the schedule table according to the layout (column 9, line 63 through column 10, line 7 and column 10, lines 35-53); The difference between Ertermalp and the claim is wherein the layout control device forms the layout by adjusting a size of the rows or columns to

accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units. While Ertermalp shows the size of the row and column, schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units, and also shows adjusting the size of the rows or columns base on the schedule quantity (when the number of days (quantity) increases from one day (Monday) to three days (Monday-Wednesday), the size of Task 4, 3D is adjusted in column to accommodate the three days inside the plurality of display units), Leong et al. clearly teaches the method of automatically adjusting window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes (column 2, lines 32-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ertemalp and Leong et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the layout control device taught by Ertemalp to include the method of automatically adjusting window size of Leong to combine the layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting a size of the rows or columns based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units with the motivation of being to display the contents in each column or row without controlling its size area as taught by Leong et al.

As to claims 3, 7 and 11, Ertemalp shows the schedule quantity is a space required for a schedule in a row or a column with a largest number of items and/or the schedule requiring a largest display area and the layout control device forms the layout such that each display unit with the largest number of

items and/or the schedule requiring the largest display area is displayed (column 2, lines 51-60 and column 5, lines 15-34).

As to claims 4, 8 and 12, Ertemalp also shows the display control device outputs data controlling the schedule table and the schedule display to a file of a format interpretable by another processing platform (column 6, lines 24-47 and column 1-10, lines 5-52).

As to claim 13, Ertemalp suggests the layout device dividing a calendar period into a plurality of display units displaying information, said display units formed in rows (figure 11, column 2, lines 30-60), shows the adjusting a length of the display units of each row to match the display unit in a respective row displaying a largest size of information inside the display unit (Column 1, lines 57-63)

As to claims 14-21, Ertemalp discloses a layout control device forming a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns defining the layout, the layout formed based on a schedule quantity inside a plurality of display units (figure 11, column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 2); a display control device controlling display of the schedule table according to the layout (column 9, line 63 through column 10, line 7 and column 10, lines 35-53); Ertermalp shows "the layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting a size of the rows and columns based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units". When the quantity Task 6 (figure 11, 250)

is bigger, both height and width of the display (6) are adjusted together to fit the change. The difference between Ertermalp and the claim is wherein the layout control device forms the layout by adjusting a size of the rows or columns to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units. While Ertermalp shows the size of the row and column, schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units, and also shows adjusting the size of the rows or columns base on the schedule quantity (when the number of days (quantity) increases from one day (Monday) to three days (Monday-Wednesday), the size of Task 4, 3D is adjusted in column to accommodate the three days inside the plurality of display units), Leong et al. clearly teaches the method of automatically adjusting window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes (column 2, lines 32-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ertemalp and Leong et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the layout control device taught by Ertemalp to include the method of automatically adjusting window size of Leong to combine the layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting a size of the rows or columns based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units with the motivation of being to display the contents in each column or row without controlling its size area as taught by Leong et al.

Response to Arguments

Regarding the argument, Applicant does not see where Ertemalp discloses "the layout is adjusted based on quantities inside the plurality of display units". However, Applicant's attention is directed to column 10, lines 5-22 "Changing the font size will cause the configurable task bar in a daybox to take up more space (if the new font size is bigger) or less space (if the new font size was smaller). The position of other task bars to be displayed in the same daybox must be adjusted to ensure all the tasks will fit in the vertical space. Adjustments are made in the task layout cache 81 by re-calculating the vertical position ..." . The underlined words disclose more clearly the feature "the layout is formed based on a schedule quantity inside a plurality of display units". In the Ertemalp's system, when the number of days (quantity) increases from one day (Monday) to three days (Monday-Wednesday), the column size of Task 4, 3D is adjusted to accommodate the three days inside the plurality of display units (figure 11). The size of task bars of Ertemalp's system depends on the start and finish time for these tasks but the system still reads on the claim feature of adjusting the column size of the row or columns based on the quantity. Although Ertemalp shows the step of adjusting the size of the row or columns, Leong et al. clearly teaches the method of automatically adjusting window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes. Applicant's attention is directed to figures 4-5, column 4, lines 25-

40 and column 2, lines 32-45 "The software presentation system automatically adjusts window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes (e.g. changes in user readable data and/or window resolution)". In the combination of Ertemalp and Leong, the feature of "the layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting a size of the rows or columns based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units" is taught.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00AM to 4:00PM at 571-272-4141. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at 571-272-4136. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703-872-9306

and / or:

571-273-4057 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran
Art Unit: 2179

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER